By Philip MacGregor,
Bournemouth University, with:

John O'Sullivan, (Eire) Aukse Balcytiene, (Lithuania) Dimitra Dimitrakopoulou, (Greece) Leopoldina Fortunati, (Italy) Micke Gulliksson, (Sweden) Vallo Nuust, (Estonia) Tanja Oblak, (Slovenia) Nayia Roussou, (Cyprus) Ramón Salaverría, (Spain) Mauro Sarrica (Italy)

Abstract
This study approaches how journalists in the United Kingdom might compare with individuals working in print journalism in 10 other countries of Europe, to assess role perceptions and beliefs in relation to the internet. The Europeans were grouped into north and south, and the UK set was independently compared with each. In all, 270 journalists across 44 newspapers in Europe gave scaled reactions to a questionnaire about their role conceptions, the internet, and the future. It appears the sampled UK journalists, despite some historical conceptions about the distinctively separate evolution of their Press, conform strikingly with European counterparts but in a specific and patterned way: the UK journalists align with counterparts from the north of Europe but have significant differences to those in the south. The principal ingredient of the division is the degree to which the journalists find the internet useful, positive and a worthwhile extension of their working opportunities. The findings conform in some respects to academic studies taking a historical and cultural approach to comparative journalism.

Introduction
The objective of this research is to discover if print journalists across Europe differ in their attitudes to the internet, its uses and potentials. This investigation includes newspapers from eleven countries: Lithuania, Latvia, Sweden, Finland, Eire, (north) and Cyprus, Italy, Spain, Greece, Slovenia (south), and Britain. The divisions are partly based on models of cross-cultural variation between geographical regions and their respective journalism practices (Hallin and Mancini, 2004a). For comparison and partly based on the same models, the UK is taken by itself, to be contrasted with the rest to investigate if it has an exceptional, divergent, or conformist character as the internet is absorbed into newsroom practices.

A selection principle on how to group countries or journalists was decided ahead of the statistical analysis. It is an assumption for comparative research that there may be discernible variation between countries, regions, or cultures of journalism. Given the available group of countries, advance decisions were taken in a manner not dissimilar to previous comparative investigations – for example Esser (1999), who decided to compare Anglo-American and German journalism, or Donsbach and Patterson (2004) who picked five countries across two continents based on a prior judgment that their journalistic structures and traditions might be different. Quandt et al. (2006) chose Germany and the US to compare, on criteria of assumed social and political similarity between the nations while Henningham and Delano (1998) put the UK alongside Australia and the US, based on similar histories, and convenience. The following sections will supply context to the decision to divide Europe into north and south groups, and to adding a third group comprising the UK alone.

Comparative analysis

Before exploring that logic, it may be helpful to give some context for comparative analysis. Large cross-national surveys were until the last decade untypical in the study of Press journalism because writers tend to focus on one or two countries at most (Esser, 1999). Deuze (2002) claims the practice is 'quite rare' before 1990, while Donsbach and Patterson (2004) observe most empirical studies of journalists' thinking has been done on individual countries. Anderson (2008), assuming the internet will not leave

professionalism 'unscathed', says:

> 'Scholars have so far done little or no research on how the impact of the internet on professional journalism varies across national boundaries, leaving to speculation whether its effects have been universal.' (p. 3911)

Comparative analysis as a method draws wide agreement on its benefits to journalism studies. Although complex in its richness of results and methods, comparative journalism has tended to show positive networks of cross-national affinities in Europe and beyond, on several dimensions in both print and broadcast (Esser, 2008: p. 415). The debates strongly invigorate discussion on the extent to which 'nation matters' (Esser, 2008) which in turn permits expectation of cross-national variations.

Several role perception studies (Deuze 2002; Donsbach and Patterson, 2004; Esser 1999; Hallin and Mancini, 2004a, 2004b; Sanders et al., 2008; Quandt et al., 2006) take a view that national characteristics may influence 'news culture' – on the assumption that national economic and political structures shape evolutions of media systems. Comparative analysis then allows us to see what is common versus idiosyncratic between countries (Reese, 2001). Single country studies, on the other hand, can deprive us of the ability to weigh what is significant or a variation of the typical (Donsbach and Patterson, 2004). The present study uses the process by taking regions (i.e. groups of neighbouring countries) as a unit of analysis as well as a single nation, the UK.

It is also reasonable to investigate if national, or transnational affinities and contrasts might be reflected in journalism's embryonic news cultures after more than a decade of the internet. There are contrary suggestions whether journalism as a whole is evolving divergently or otherwise at a supra-national or European level. Hallin and Mancini (2004b) reflect one tendency when they claim globalization has 'clearly diminished the differences between nationally distinct systems of media and political communication,' (p. 41). However these authors (2004a) principally assert that there are still broad supra-national differences found in European news media systems, reflecting actual and institutional geographies of regions. Donsbach and Patterson (2004: p. 252) emphasise that Western journalists operate in non-identical Press traditions or media and political structures. 'These differences can be expected to produce differences in the way journalists see and do their job.' Meanwhile, a recent comparative work suggests 'permeability' in practices and principles across national borders as some aspects of news cultures replicate to create wider 'distinct news cultures' (Esser, 2008: p.422). He nevertheless comes down on the side that 'nation matters' most for news culture, though part of this rich debate relies on distinguishing 'news cultures' from media systems or 'journalistic cultures' (Esser, 2008: p. 401). It may be that neither determines the other since content values and institutional ethics may be developing independently, as is discussed later. Preston (2009) asserts that 'news culture' remains fixed in nations commenting that 'the notion of an emergent European editorial culture or public sphere is difficult to defend.' That multi-nation study in the Europe concludes that national traditions or systems dominate professional practices.

Whether journalists can be treated 'professionally' as a culturally independent, pan-national group at all is a matter of fervent debate (e.g. Sparks and Splichal, 1994; Deuze, 2002, 2005; Weaver et al., 2007; Anderson, 2008; Preston, 2009). Most accounts suggest common attributes of the contested term 'professional'. Sanders et al. (2008) assert some commonalities between British and Spanish trainee journalists. Reese (2001) cautions that professionalism may carry different meanings according to cultural context, while Donsbach and Patterson (2004) and Hampton (2008), explore such ambiguity in the notion of 'objectivity'. Pfetsch and Esser (2004) summarise a complex issue with the view that there are 'significantly more similarities than differences across western European news systems also a consensus over fundamental duties of journalists,' (p.16). Deuze (2005) reflects that journalists in elective

democracies broadly 'share similar characteristics and speak of similar values' (p. 445). Preston's finding of an 'absence of any shared dimension to journalistic cultures' in Europe is understandable if a distinction between content and organizational values is made. The field of comparative enquiry is thus suggesting a fascinating patchwork of cultural contrasts and affinities which still seems very dependent on initial theoretical assumptions and distinctions. An example of a midway point between national, regional or universal cultural patterning of journalism is that of the 'three distinct political news cultures' found by Esser (2008).

Typologies of 'professional' roles focus on certain characteristics. Definitions include tendencies towards norms of 'advocacy', 'neutrality', 'intervention', or 'interpretive' functions of journalism (Esser, 1999; 2008; Hallin and Mancini, 2004a; Weaver et al., 2007), or its mission to 'disseminate' (Weaver et al., 2007), to 'educate', or definitions of 'objectivity', its 'passivity' or 'participation' (Donsbach and Patterson, 2004), or its 'adversarial' (Weaver et al., 2007) and 'watchdog' roles (Henningham and Delano, 1998).

1. The regional divisions proposed

The following section expandsQ on the chosen way to divide journalistic cultures in Europe, particularly mirroring Hallin and Mancini (2004a), who group Western countries according to three media systems. The typical beliefs and characteristics of journalists approximate, they say, to three 'ideal types' of media: the 'polarised pluralism' system in southern Europe, 'democratic corporatist' in the north, and the Anglo-American 'North Atlantic or liberal' model for the UK and US. Media systems vary according to four properties: Professionalism, market orientation, the role of the state, and political parallelism, the latter referring to the closeness of the bond between parties, political groups and media. Specific cultural variations that underpin these media models reflect contrasting regional histories.

The authors' (2004a) historically grounded divisions help legitimate the logic taking a north-south comparative regional grouping. If this is accepted, it is reasonable to suppose that online journalism may be dependent on the same cultural structures that affect print journalism's role perceptions. Of course, the variations, if any, between cultures of online journalism may not exactly reflect the picture in the journalism styles from which they have evolved.

Finally, a further rationale for asserting splitting northern from southern regions arises from administrative example. The United Nations divide Europe according to north and south. On a practical level, the global news agency Associated Press considers the news needs and values of the two regions as distinct[1]. In north and south many different cultural and historical factors operate, especially the Classical legacy of the south and, latterly, the region's far stronger connections with Fascism (Spain, Italy, Greece). To these differences can be added linguistic groupings, and differing rates of secularisation (Hallin and Mancini, 2004a). Each collection of factors may entail some reciprocal relationships with journalistic belief systems in tandem with broader political and cultural evolution.

2. The British case

As Donsbach and Patterson (2004) point out, it is through comparison with other cases that the exceptionalism of a particular case can be confirmed or disconfirmed. British journalism is isolated as the third group for comparison[3], as distinct from north or south groups, partly on the basis of Hallin and Mancini's third ideal type. Their portrayal of Britain's as part of the Anglo-Amercian 'North Atlantic or liberal' media model have been taken as a qualified theoretical justification for testing the UK independent of European groups, since its character might differ from either, or any, of the others.

The 'liberal' model proposes a stronger tradition of neutrality than the other two variants, a dominance of commercially derived 'information-style journalism', less self-regulation, marketised mass-circulation papers, strong professionalism, and weaker political parallelism. Hallin and Mancini (2004b: p. 30) contend that continental journalism is more rooted in organised social groups, reflecting internal social institutions of respective countries, and 'this sets them apart from the more individualistic market-orientated American political and media systems', including Britain. Others too characterize British journalism as particularly market driven and competitive (Franklin, 1997; Esser, 1999; Punie, 2002). It is also seen as being especially strongly divided between provincial and national papers, and as erroneously seeing itself as emphatically British (Tunstall, 1971).

That Britain's journalism is similarly linked to the United States rather than Europe is evident in the widely used term 'Anglo-Saxon journalism' as distinct from 'continental' journalism (Chalaby, 1996). This echoes Hallin and Mancini's (2004b) observed dynamic of the gradual 'Americanisation' of European political communication (p.34). Particularly the notion of 'objectivity' is regarded by several scholars as a 'transatlantic journalistic norm'(Hampton, 2008: p.478). Meanwhile Deuze (2002: p. 144) annotates a role difference in newsroom organisation found between Anglo-American journalism and practices on the European continent.

Another line of argument, however, portrays Britain's journalism as distinct. In an intercontinental comparison with the US and Australia, Henningham and Delano (1998) say its investigative bent and strong impulse to disseminate fast sets British print journalism apart. British journalists also demonstrate more intense 'adversarial' qualities than found in the US. In the same way, Kocher (1986) used the term 'bloodhound' to depict the British journalist compared to the German 'missionary'. Chalaby (1996) notes British 'fact-centred' discourse compared to French 'literary' culture of journalism while Hallin and Mancini (2004b: p.214) observe pronounced 'class stratification'. Preston (2009) remarks its journalists were clearest in their rejection of a notion of a common European culture (p. 153).

Britain has also been depicted as having affinities with individual countries of both north and south Europe. Donsbach and Patterson (2004) point to British, Swedish and Italian news interpretation systems that rest 'between German and US styles' (p. 261). Italian journalists are more likely to see 'championing particular values and ideas' as important compared to the British and Swedish (p. 180). Sanders et al. (2008), identify similarity between Spanish and British journalism for prioritizing transmission but not in adherence to public service norms.

Focusing on the web, British journalism has rarely been studied on a comparative basis. UK news media display a fast-evolving relationship with the internet with several supra-national news sites – the *BBC online, The Daily Telegraph,* and *Guardian* online in particular - and many with high user numbers based in part on English being a global language.

3. Cross-European studies show conservatism

An early cross-European study of adoption and multimedia convergence by De Aquino et al. (2002), takes as a premise that there are variations in European adoption rates between and within countries. They contrasted the UK's so called market-orientated journalism with that of Sweden, France and Spain. The authors discovered considerable caution across Europe generally in journalists' approach to technology and convergence:

> 'Print journalists, despite acknowledging the advantages of convergence, tend to feel threatened over-exploited and sceptical as regards the present and future quality of newspapers that adopt the new buzz-trends.' (p. 70)

UK internet development was included in a wider pan-European investigation of 16 countries'

newspapers (Van der Wurff and Lauf, 2005). In it, Sparks (2005) took three newspapers, the *Times*, the *Guardian* and the *Telegraph*. He reported the UK had few exceptional positions vis-a-vis 15 other European countries in which similar papers and their internet offspring were compared for content and design. But mostly the UK differed only in degree from the other 15 countries.

To conclude, the research questions evolved are:

1. Are attitudes among groups of newspaper journalists across Europe common or divergent in evaluating the uses of the internet?
2. What characterises differences between northern and Mediterranean journalists' role perceptions and beliefs about the internet, if found?
3. To which group, if either, does the UK sample of journalists mostly belong – north or south – and thus how does 'region' compare with 'nation' as a unit of analysis?
4. Is there a positive relationship between journalists' perceptions of internet potential, and comparative media models, particularly that of Hallin and Mancini (2004a)?

Research method

The groups UK, north and south, are picked for the reasons outlined above[2]. The continental European countries taken are Lithuania, Latvia, Sweden, Finland, Eire – the north group – and Cyprus, Italy, Spain, Greece, Slovenia, – the south. The journalist numbers in each group are 65 (UK), 107 (north), 98 (south).While the UK is isolated specifically for comparison with north and south[3], there is no prior assumption that it belongs to either, or that it might not be exceptional. It is stressed that there is no statistical imperative conjuring these groups, although north/south/UK groupings would have been discarded if the number of significant differences by the Kruskal-Wallis test over the 105 variables was uninterestingly small.

The project arose resulting from the EU COST A20 initiative on the impact of the internet in Europe, which led to the formation of this cross-country research initiative. The questionnaire, using a Likert scale 1-5, was designed and distributed by the group. The questions were presented over 18 months by 11 academics – usually native to the country investigated. Quantifying human reactions is imperfect – individuals differ in the range of emotion, the description of feeling, understanding of questions, and moods, while the width of the difference between one number and another, when applied to opinion, is unknown. Honesty of answers was however probably quite high since personal contact was made with many respondents.

The Kruskal-Wallis test was used on each variable to compare the three groups. For significant variables, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to discover which pairs differ. It is critical to realize that significance has the specific meaning that two or more tested populations (the UK alone or groups of countries) diverge, rather than that there are differences of degree.

Nation as a unit of data collection is a contestable choice, but language skills of individual researchers allowed sensitive interviews. All journalists were asked to self-categorise as either online journalist (30), or print journalist (163), or print and online journalist (72). The mean service length in journalism for each group was 7.7 (online) 12.4 (print and online) and 16 years (print-only). The average real age of each group was 32 (online), 37 (print and online) and 40 (print-only), the youngest stating themselves as 21 and the oldest 60. The journalists – 101 women and 169 men – were interviewed in 2005-6-7 from 'serious' widely read newspapers in each country. A normal selection principle was 'prominence' of the title in the particular country's news system but, while by no means random, this yardstick is approximate. The

limitations of the sample allow only for indicative and illustrative conclusions. It is not claimed that this sample was properly representative of the nations' newspaper cultures or achieved full consistency between nations.

Three newspapers at least were normally included from each country, ideally nine journalists from each title. Emails were sent to chosen journalists. Where possible, three of the nine respondents should work as online journalists or have a job combining print and online work. The UK's London-based papers chosen would term themselves as 'quality' press: *The Guardian, The Daily Telegraph*, the *Times*, the *Financial Times*, the *Independent*, while the provincials, the *Northern Echo*, (Darlington), *The Herald* (Glasgow) and the *Western Daily Press* (Bristol) aspire to serve and accurately reflect their communities. The *Financial Times,* which is a pan-European paper, the *Guardian,* with a large US readership, and *Daily Telegraph* adopted the internet relatively early.

The 105 questions focus on the perceived impact of the internet on newspaper journalists – covering the future of journalism, the adoption of the internet, working practices, some aspects of ethics, core journalism values, relations with the public, the internet's new tools, the value of new media now and in the future, and perception of some of its key apparent novelties such as interactivity, and, finally, perception of the use of the internet in furthering the social role of journalism. This analysis focuses on relative opinion between groups.

Note: 'p' in tables is the Mann-Whitney U test statistic with a Bonferroni adjustment, taken here to be significant if below p=0.017. For visual ease the significant p numbers are in bold. *(See tables).*

Findings and discussion

There was significant difference between one or more groups on almost half the total 105 questions asked of the journalists about their professional perception of the internet. The sampled European journalists are apparently heterogeneous in some attitudes to the future of newspapers and to their practices and beliefs.

The largest number of all differences is found between the UK journalists and southerners - 78 % of all questions on which there was a significant difference (about 38% of all 105 questions). By far the fewest number of significant differences is seen between the north of Europe and the UK. (19%) The only area tested in the questionnaire in which these patterns are broken concerns adoption of the internet, in which the UK journalists seemed more in line with the south.

The northern group also differs from the south in almost as many cases as the UK (72%), and on all save six (12.7%), the differences are on the same answers. The common variables on which north and UK align suggests strongly that this affinity between UK and north is non ramdom and reflects an aspect of reality.

The precise figures are that 37 of 47 significant variables distinguish the UK from the south, while 34 variables divide north from the south. Twenty six of these cases also include the UK so that only nine answers divide the UK respondents from the north (19%). This is fewer than a third of the number that divide UK and south. North and the UK differ only one third as often as north and UK differ from the south (9 – 26).

With great clarity these data suggest that the UK does not stand alone or distinct from European print journalism in perceptions of professional roles and the internet. In only one of all significant cases did its journalists take an exceptional position, differing from both north and south at the same time. This is less than one percent of all 105 questions asked.

There are concentrations of significant differences in thoughts about internet journalism. Decisively, the north and UK value the web higher than the south as a means to some of the traditional public justifications of Western journalism – its investigation and the criticism of power, its ability to inform the public, and to influence aspects of the democratic process. A summary of the detail and nuances of the responses are outlined below.

1. Relations with the public, and quality

In respect of journalists' view of the relationship with readers and internet users, the UK aligns almost always in the significant cases with the north and never with the south. The UK journalists mirror the north in these significant cases, taking a position more favourable to the net than those in the south. *(See table 1)* Accountability, speed and accuracy, double-checking opportunities, assessing positive desire for net use from their publics and greater trust in the net is demonstrated by UK and north in contrast to the southern sample. They demonstrate belief in a more affirmative potential of the web to tie journalism to its publics.

2. Perception of the future and the job

Four out of eight questions show significant variations on the future and the internet *(See table 2)*. To the important question that 'Newspapers must embrace the internet to survive', the UK is the least equivocal: they must, while for thesouth, there is most doubt. The UK seem least willing to see themselves as information packers, which is, after all, a non-creative perception of the professional role. The southerners also show skepticism of online potentials including ability to include background information into stories, and they suspect the internet is more likely to produce more superficial journalism.

3. Innovation potentials

Turning to the innovative potential of the internet, four out of the six questions see the respondents emphatically divided by region and country *(See table 3)*. The UK and north journalists sense that the internet tends to be more useful for including information, and that web multimedia adds job satisfaction. They positively agree they can find more exclusive information on the web, while only the southerners believe technology has become too influential in journalism. The UK differs from the north alone in believing that the web allows more information to be included in stories.

4. The future and anticipated impacts

Opinions about the future of newspapers, and possible strategies for internet use divide the sample. Three of nine variables show significant differences *(See table 4)*. On the attractiveness of multimedia, the UK and north answer favourably, echoing their answer that multimedia enhances job satisfaction. They prefer to publish news online first in contrast to the south. The Atlantic state is more positive than south on how far they believe the internet has 'increased possibilities' for journalism.

5. Journalists and the democratic ideal

Regional differences become evident in questions connected to the view of the role of journalism in democratic societies. Quite overwhelmingly, the northern and the UK diverge from the southern journalists *(See table 5)*. Of 15 questions, six show north and UK sharing views in significant contrast to the south: There seems an underlying philosophical difference in the role of the Press, the Mediterranean countries considering themselves less adversarial, less active, and less influential on democratic processes, which

corresponds to the model of Hallin and Mancini (2004a).

In the variable 'Get news to the public as quickly as possible', the UK and north put a higher value on this than the south. On the dimension, 'Be a watchdog for democracy,' the UK and the north answer more affirmatively by far. It would seem the internet is perceived as being more effective in the northern and UK regions in promoting the criticism of power. Two more variables which explore perceived effects on the public – the supposed influence of web journalism on political agendas and on public opinion – also suggest southerners sampled are more lethargic about endorsing the internet.

The democratic power of interactivity is tested in the criterion 'Give people forum for public deliberation.' The UK and the north embrace this goal more avidly, perhaps endorsing judgments of a less elitist disposition of news media outside the 'polarised pluralist' sphere (Hallin and Mancini, 2004a). Similarly, the UK and north are more agreeable to the suggestion that the web helps journalists 'Reach the widest possible audience'. The UK and north diverge only on one dimension, that the web is helping journalists promote interest groups, perhaps conforming to the 'neutrality' ideal that is strongest in the Atlantic media model (Hallin and Mancini, 2004a).

6. Journalism imagined 'without the web'

The power of the internet to help investigative journalism – consistent with a 'watchdog role' – is one of three significant answers among 13 questions on survival without the internet *(See table 6)*. UK and south differ. There is much uniformity between the groups on basic necessities of journalism – for example tracking stories, keeping up to date, publishing breaking news in real time, interaction with readers, data-checking, and speed of information gathering. Even so UK journalists take a more negative view than north or south of how they would react to getting story ideas without the web.

7. Significance of technology
Three of five questions about technological change and the future divide the groups *(See table 7)*. North and south differ particularly on beliefs about the future of mobile devices and digital broadcasting online. The UK respondents mirrored both groups on these issues, but on free papers and the future, north and UK opinions vary from the south.

8. How useful for sources?
Four out of eight answers differed on journalistic ways of dealing with sources of information. The UK journalists are, for example, more enthusiastic than either region as users of local authority reports via the web and more avid than southerners in using the web to access corporate reports. North/south differed on fact-checking and background *(See table 8)*.

9. Adoption of the internet

Attitudes to the problems introducing technology and of managerial attitudes sharply differ from the patterns noted so far *(See table 9)*. Here, the UK separates itself from the north. On the whole it seems the north had a smoother ride with technology than others, with the south the roughest.

10. Information-gathering techniques

Eight questions of 19 about information gathering methods showed one or more significant difference. Nearly half communication styles are rated differently by one of UK, north or south *(See table 10)*. The UK is aligns with the north rather than south in four cases. Although it is still the most popular form of communication, the UK journalists, for example, valued talking to contacts face-to-face less than

southerners but they rated using the telephone more, like northerners. UK and north groups sampled are keener to use search engines and newsfeeds. Weblogs are valued more in the UK compared to the south. Overall, there is a preference for internet technologies in the UK and north.

Conclusions

The cross-country survey reflects a transitional moment in the enculturation of some journalists in relation to the internet, illustrating their vision of its possibilities on their practices and desires.
The differing emphases between groups seem explicable partly within existing definitions of the cultures of journalism – even with the caveat that there is no guarantee that they are typical of other journalists around them.

Results point to a heterogonous mindset of these three groups of journalists interviewed (research question one). Looking at implied meanings, it can be deduced that *the level of enthusiasm for the web* is one key principle of differentiation between them (research question two). Often, where there are significant differences, the UK journalist is found to be most positive of the three groups about the internet .

Like those in the north region, UK journalists studied feel empowered by the internet for research, investigation, as an aid to their work, and as a means of winning public support – more emphatically than Mediterranean partners. The enthusiasm extends to technological potentials: interactivity and multimedia storytelling. The web is regarded as an enabler for journalism's perceived goals. Speed, depth of research, and participatory power are valued by northern and UK respondents relative to south. The same pattern applies in these journalists' view of audiences – who are assumed less web-trusting and less web-friendly by Mediterranean journalists than the rest. It cannot be asserted, therefore, that the internet's effects, if they should be conceived that way at all, have been 'universal' on journalism (Anderson, 2008). Of course, it should be remembered that just above 50% of the 105 questions showed insignificant differences across all Europe and some of these include multi-media, interactive potentials and desire to influence publics.

In general, a dissimilar European tradition of democratic, cultural and economic development still correlates to an indicative pattern of 'professional' differences that can be seen as the internet is integrated into newsrooms. Factors exerting influence reflect market journalism – such as speed of news delivery, fact orientation, independence from the state, and the watchdog role. The northern 'democratic corporatist' countries sampled seem to diverge from the 'polarised pluralist' region, (Hallin and Mancini, 2004a) whose adoption and enthusiasm for the internet appears weakest.

In this perspective, 'regions' compare effectively with 'nations' as units of analysis to define and correlate journalism's attitudinal cultures – in ways made meaningful by wider social and contextual conditions. As journalism domesticates new technology, the partial separation of cultures north and south seem broadly to endorse Hallin and Mancini's analysis (2004a) of the influences of regional structural, political, and historical factors on professional attitudes (research question four). In that respect, 'region' appears to be a principle of coherence more effective than 'nation' – notwithstanding the fact that conformity with aspects of Hallin and Mancini's typology is correlation only.

Interpreting regionalism enforces a need for further clarity distinguishing 'news cultures' from 'journalistic culture' (Esser, 2008, p. 401). If common elements define some attitudinal outlooks (journalistic culture)

within regions, that convergence does not therefore extend to affect content (news culture). Research seems to suggest content shaping is resolutely national (Preston 2009; Guyot et al, 2008; Esser, 2008; Esser and D'Angelo, 2006; Van der Wurff and Lauf, 2005).

Thus we may speculate that a distinctive 'journalistic culture' uniting a region is not predictive of a similar convergence of content. 'Democratic' aspirations or participatory sympathies that journalists may distinctively share across parts of Europe have no necessary influence on some of the broadest framing of content. There is, after all, no essential contradiction between an emphatically national culture of journalism outputs that emanate from supra-national role perceptions. There might therefore be an emerging formal convergence of professional norms in Europe but an overarching persistence of national 'prisms' in presentation of content (Guyot et al, 2008).

This survey could be taken, in that case, as a sign that print and online journalism's attitudinal cultures – as opposed to news cultures – are edging towards more independence of national political and media structures. They are perhaps emerging as increasingly supra-national (Esser, 2008: p. 425, p. 415). Regional convergence across nations seen here might then be indicative of a step on a longer journey to a synthesis of journalism role beliefs.

In this model of change, the affinity of the UK and the north would be a sign of further incursion of Anglo-US journalism cultures into Europe, as is reportedly the opinion of some European journalists (Preston, 2009: p151). The Anglo-US intrusion is thus stronger in the north, less marked in the south. Most likely two processes are at work and in tension. One is towards universalism (or Americanisation). The other is a shaping of internet integration that reflects endogenous regional cultural conditions.

The essential indication of these findings is simply that there is a tentative, partial duality in web journalism attitudes in parts of Europe ten or so years after the birth of a commercial internet. The implied duality does not integrate with Preston's (2009) position that there is an 'absence of *any* shared dimension in journalistic cultures [in Europe]' (p. 160). On the other hand it does bear out a general view that there is no *single* trans-European journalistic attitudinal culture. In displaying an in-between picture of regional patterning, these indicative findings may be of value to reinforce caution in using national histories and structures to frame comparative research on journalism role perception. That 'nation matters' as a principal defining force would certainly not cover every case as the web was being absorbed into newsrooms, which reflects for new media perceptions the cross-national patterns marked by Pfetsch and Esser (2004).

Turning expressly to the UK sample, the results cast interesting light on suggestions that 'Anglo-American' journalism often contrasts with some continental forms (Hallin and Mancini, 2004a; Chalaby, 1998; Henningham and Delano, 1998). The affinity with the north implies that a competing model for the UK is not so successful. On one view, in answer to the third research question, the UK journalists sampled could more fairly be identified within Hallin and Mancini's 'democratic corporatist' system rather than the 'liberal' model. Alternatively, as discussed above, perhaps an Anglo-US market model is gaining a more hegemonic hold across the northern continent (Preston, 2009: p. 151). Either way, for online role perceptions and predictions of the future, one model might roughly apply across northern Europe but how this is defined would need further work. At any rate, the view of UK national singularity from European neighbours is not sustained for online perceptions (research question three), whereas a picture of continuing European regional and system variations in journalism is consistent with this evidence.

Finally, had the British journalism been mapped with the northern group, the overall picture in relation to the partial divergence of European perceptions about the internet would barely have altered. That is not to say there might not be patterns of statistical difference in other groupings of the countries studied – say East and West – and there probably are (Fortunati et al., 2009). An appreciable, if subtle, difference in the formation of attitudes to the internet in print journalism is suggested here. These mostly correlate to aspects

of media institutional arrangements that are grounded on evolving cultural, social and political climates of the regions in which they are found.

Footnotes

1. Nigel Baker, Managing Editor of APTN, London, in a recorded conversation with the author, 2007.
2. Any country grouping is in a sense arbitrary – any number of groupings of European countries could be taken as rational – East/West, economic advance rates, internet penetration, engagement with 'modernity', GDP (per capita or gross), degrees of secularization, etc. All have some drawbacks and few have such a strong ground in journalistic literature and historical administration as north/south.
3. Any country in the sample could have been taken alone for contrast with the groups. But one main author has a special interest in the UK as a former journalist there – combined with the argument (above) suggesting it is reasonable to test the country as a case apart.

References

Anderson, C. (2008) "Professionalisation of Journalists," in *The International Encyclopaedia of Communication,* Donsbach W. (ed). Blackwell

Aquino, R. Bierhoff, J. Orchard, T. and Stone, M. (2002) "The European Multimedia News Landscape", Mudia Report. Heerlen: International Institute of Infonomics.

Chalaby, J. (1996) "Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention," European Journal of Communication, Vol 11, No 3 (3), pp. 303-326

Deuze, M. (2005) "What is Journalism? Professional Identity and Ideology of Journalists Reconsidered," Journalism. Vol 6, (4) pp. 442-464

Deuze, M. (2002) "National News Cultures: A Comparison of Dutch, German, British, Australian, and U.S. Journalists," Journalism Quarterly Vol. 79 (3), (1) pp. 134-149

Donsbach, W. Patterson T. (2004) "Political News Journalists: Partisanship, Professionalism, and Political Roles in Five Countries", pp. 251-270 in Frank Esser & Barbara Pfetsch (eds) *Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Esser, F.(1999) "Tabloidisation of news: A comparative Analysis of Anglo-American and German Press Journalism," European Journal of Communication, Vol. 14 pp. 291-324

Esser, F. Pfetsch, B. (2004) *Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Esser, F. and D'Angelo, P. (2006) "Framing the Press and Publicity Process in U.S., British, and German General Election Campaigns: A Comparative Study of Metacoverage," Harvard Journal of Press/Politics Vol. 11 (3) pp. 44-66.

Esser, F. (2008) "Dimensions of political news cultures: Sound Bite and Image Bite News in France, Germany, Great Britain and the United States," Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, Vol 13 (4), pp. 401-428

Fortunati, L. Sarrica, M. O' Sullivan, J. Balcytiene, A. Harro-Loit, H. MacGregor, P. Rousseau, N. Salaverria, R. de Luca, F. (2009) "The Influence of the Internet on European Journalism," Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication Vol. 14 pp. 928-963

Franklin, R. (1997) *Newzak and News Media*, Arnold

Guyot, J. Kovács, A. Kryzyzanowski, M. Preston, P. Schultz-Forberg, Stråth, B. ter Wall, J. Wodak, R. Zagar, I. (2008) Final Report: A summary of the EMEDIATE project providing for

new theoretical understandings on the European public sphere, an overview of the media debates in Europe and their definition and representation of European ethics and values , Deliverable D15, accessed online
Http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Research/EMEDIATE/documents/WP8FinalReport.pdf

Hallin, D. and Mancini P. (2004a) *Comparing Media Systems Three Models of Media and Politics.* Cambridge University Press

Hallin D. and Mancini P. (2004b) "Americanisation, Globalisation, and Secularisation: Understanding the Convergence of Media Systems and Political Communication, " in Frank Esser & Barbara Pfetsch (eds) *Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges.* New York: Cambridge University Press

Hampton, M. (2008) "The 'Objectivity' ideal and its Limitations in 20th Century British Journalism," Journalism Studies Vol. 9 (4), pp. 477-493

Henningham, J. and Delano, A. (1998) "The British Journalist," in *The Global Journalist: News People Around the World,* David Weaver (ed); New Jersey: Hampton Press.

Kocher, R. (1986) "Bloodhounds and Missionaries: role definitions of German and British Journalists," European Journal of Communication, Vol. 12 (1) pp. 43-64

Quandt, T. Loffelholz, M. Weaver, D. Hanitzsch, T. Altmeppen, K. (2006) "American and German Online Journalists at the Beginning of the 21st Century," Journalism Studies Vol 7 (2) pp. 171-186

Preston, P. (2009) *Making the news: Journalism and News Cultures in Europe,* Routledge

Punie, Y. (2002) "Trends in Online European Media," MUDIA (Multimedia in the Digital Age), http://www.ecdc.info/publications/index.php

Reese, S. (2001) "Understanding the Global Journalist: A hierarchy-of-influences approach," Journalism Studies, Vol 2, (2) pp. 173–187

Sanders, K. Hanna, M. Berganza, M. Sanchez Aranda, J. (2008) "Journalists: A Comparison of the Professional Attitudes and Values of British and Spanish Journalism," European Journal of Communication Vol. 23 (2) pp. 133-152

Sparks, C. (2005) "The United Kingdom, The Triumph of Quality?" in Van der Wurff, and Lauf (eds) *Print and Online Newspapers in Europe: A Comparative Analysis in 16 Countries* Het Spinhuis, Amsterdam

Splichal, S. Sparks, C. (1994) *Journalists for the 21st Century, Ablex*

Tunstall, J. (1971) *Journalists at work: Specialist Correspondents, Their News Organizations, News Sources, and Competitor-Colleagues,* London: Constable

Van der Wurff, R. and Lauf, E. (eds) (2005) *Print and Online Newspapers in Europe: A ComparativeAanalysis in 16Ccountries* Het Spinhuis, Amsterdam

Weaver, D. Beam, R. Brownlee, B. Voakes, G. Wilhoit, C. (2007) *The American Journalist in the 21st Century: U.S. News People at the Dawn of a New Millennium* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tables

Table A

The newspapers

|Medium |Journalists | | Medium |Journalists |

	(freq.)			(freq.)
Aamulehti	9		Kathimerini	3
Anyksta	2		Kauno diena	2
breakingnews.ie	3		La Stampa	7
Corriere della Sera	9		La Vanguardia	5
Dagens Nyheter	5		Lietuvos rytas	2
Delo	13		Lietuvos zinios	6
Dnevnik	7		N Echo	8
El Mundo	9		Õhtuleht	3
El País	6		Päevaleht	3
Eleftherotypia	6		Panevezio balsas	1
Financial Times	9		Phileleftheros	4
Goteborgsposten	7		Postimees	7
Guardian	9		Repubblica	9
Helsingin Sanomat	9		Senska Dagbladet	1
Il Sole 24 Ore	9		Simerini	5
ireland.com	3		Svenska Dagbladet	6
Irish Examiner	5		Ta Nea	5
Irish Independent	6		Times	8
Irish Times	6		Vecer	10
Valeva	9		Verslo zinos	3
Herald (Glasgow)	8		Western Daily Press	7
Independent	7		Telegraph	9

Table 1

Relations with the public, and quality

Pairs	UK: Mean ranks	North: Mean ranks	South: Mean ranks	Mann-Whitney U comparison statistic	Significance (probability, p, of the test statistic under the null hypothesis)

Group	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	MW U statistic	Significance (p)
V 1 The public demands that newspapers make use of online possibilities –					
UK/South	97.73		78.99	2673	.013
UK/North	90.68	74.61		2484	.027/2 =.012
North/South		103.37	101.71	4165	.837
V 2 In important issues the audience prefers print media					
UK/South	67.34	98.14		2232	<.001
UK/North	82.09		80.26	3049	.801
North/South		81.2	120.66	3139	<.001
V 3 Print media serves the audience better than online media –					
UK/South	69.95		96.56	2401.5	.001
UK/North	75.75	85.36		2778.5	.183
North/South		90.53	113.3	4028	.004
V 4 Print media is more trusted than online media					
UK/South	81.36		88.84	3143	.314
UK/North	81.28	70.14		2321	.101
North/South		84.05	104.57	3490	.008
V 5 The internet makes it easier to double check information					
UK/South	98.77		78.36	2606	.007
UK/North	83.41	79.41		2949	.576
North/South		112.03	93.86	4265	.023/2 =.012
V 6 The internet's interactivity makes journalism more accountable to the public					
UK/South	103.98		75.88	2341	<.001
UK/North	86.54	78.99		2890	.302
North/South		115.81	91.27	3988	.002
V 7 Online Journalism has sacrificed accuracy for speed					
UK/South	71.38		93.81	2481	.003
UK/North	78.76	82.44		2946	.617
North/South		91.11	113.89	4077	.005

Table 2
Perception of the future and the job

Group	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	MW U statistic	Significance (p)
V 8 Newspapers will have to embrace the internet to survive					
UK/South	11795		67.40	1433	<.001
UK/North	85.62	67.76		2105	.005
North/South		117.76	79.61	2740	<.001
V 9 Online, journalists have better tools for giving					

Group	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	MW U statistic	Significance (p)
background information					
UK/South	109.1		72,.18	1945	<.001
UK/North	90.48	74.75		2497	.032
North/South		115.58	90.64	3920	.002
V 10 Online Journalists are more information packers than creators of original content					
UK/South	65.63		98.49	2121	<.001
UK/North	72.34	87.64		2557	.036/2 = .018
North/South		90.85	112.21	4059	.008
V 11 The internet is rendering journalistic work more superficial					
UK/South	75.82		92.99	2783	.025/2= 013
UK/North	80.19	83.2		3067	.682
North/South		93.52	111.69	4313	.025/2 =.013

Table 3

Innovation potentials

Group	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	MW U statistic	Significance (p)
V12 With the internet journalists can get more information into stories than before					
UK/South	66.98		81.67	2203	.032/2 = .016
UK/North	67.06	89.96		2209	.001
North/South		96.81	88.71	3889	.269
V13 Working with multi media outlets makes journalistic work more rewarding					
UK/South	101.2		75.37	2318	.001
UK/North	82.63	79.95		2984	.712
North/South		116.47	89.58	3824	.001
V14 Journalists do not find information on the internet that they wouldn't have found otherwise.					
UK/South	74.11		92.21	2653	.017
UK/North	80.793.66	80.37		3043	.964
North/South		91.73	112.27	4144	.011
V 15 Alongside the development of the internet the importance of journalists' technological tools has increased too much					
UK/South	71.16		93.23	2467	.004
UK/North	79.16	81.37		2971	.761
North/South		91.54	111.57	4126	.013

Table 4

The future and anticipated impacts

Groups	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
V 16 Multimedia is an important new component presenting stories to the audience					

Groups	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
UK/South	99.22		78.09	2578	.004
UK/North	80.08	71.18		2395	.169
North/South		102.79	91.50	4012	.137
V 17 News should be published online as quickly as possible					
UK/South	71.61		95.55	2509	.001
UK/North	81.29	82.47		3139	.873
North/South		88.77	116.03	3848	.001
V 18 The internet has opened new journalistic possibilities for newspapers					
UK/South	96.35		80.51	2837	.020 / 2 = .010
UK/North	87.35	78.45		2837	.164
North/South		107.95	98.46	4757	.197

Table 5
Journalists and the democratic ideal

Groups	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
V 19 Get news to the public as quickly as possible					
UK/South	97.22		79.99	2781	.012
UK/North	82.12	81.92		3177	.972
North/South		113.4	93.45	4221	.005
V 20 Reach the widest possible audience					
UK/South	103.03	75.56		2338	<.001
UK/North	85.85	79.45		2935	.323
North/South		115.65	90.34	3905	.001
V 21 Be a watchdog for democracy					
UK/South	97.88	76.26		2471	.004
UK/North	80.27	80.65		3057	.958
North/South		115.08	87.04	3592	<.001
V 22 Exert an influence on the political agenda					
UK/South	99.48		75.28	2369	.001
UK/North	86.03	77.68		2782	.235
North/South		111.55	91.16	4020	.007
V 23 Influence public opinion					
UK/South	94.84		79.00	2730	.031 / 2 = .016
UK/North	78.78	82.46		2967	.596
North/South		113.65	90.27	3913	.003
V 24 Provide a forum for public deliberation					
UK/South	96.85		76.9	2537	.007
UK/North	78.94	81.54		2972	.715
North/South		114.49	87.58	3648	.001

Groups	UK Mean rank	North Mean rank	South Mean rank	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
V 25 Be a spokesperson for certain groups					
UK/South	90.82		81.54	2972	.216
UK/North	90.06	72.49		2327	.014
North/South		95.03	106.35	4468	.151

Table 6

Journalism 'without the web'

Groups	UK Mean rank	North Mean rank	South Mean rank	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
V 26 Variable: Getting story ideas – imagined effect if journalists had no web					
UK/South	96.41		78.92	2694	.019 / 2 = .009
UK/North	87.68	77.46		2740	.141
North/South		108.83	96.65	4573	.118
V 27 Variable: Investigative journalism projects – imagined effect if journalists had no web					
UK/South	72.13		92.11	2536	.007
UK/North	72.05	86.91		2531	.038
North/South		96.02	105.65	4560	.218
V 28 Variable: Ease of keeping in touch with the newsroom – effect if journalists had no web					
UK/South	73.8		89.4	2632	.027 / 2 = .018
UK/North	76.6	83.7		2815	.299
North/South		94.6	107	4429	.109

Table 7

Significance of technology

Groups	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
V 29 Digital Broadcasting					
UK/South	91.73		80.90	2929	.152
UK/North	76.77	82.18		2833	.452
North/South		111.08	90.92	3982	.011
V 30 Mobile devices					
UK/South	92.56		81.13	2953	.131

Groups	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
UK/North	78	83.03		2925	.486
North/South		111.38	91.51	4044	.013
V 31 Free Papers					
UK/South	97.05		78.52	2652	.015
UK/North	81.85	79.6		2985	.756
North/South		111.5	92.36	4119	.017

Table 8

How useful for sources?

Groups	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
V 32 Accessing Local authorities' reports and other information					
UK/South	98.51		78.33	2632`	.007
UK/North	91.32	74.01		2449	.016
North/South		104.56	98.73	4794	.463
V 33 Verifying facts					
UK/South	92.24		80.59	2896	.122
UK/North	77.15	83.54		2857	.375
North/South		111.72	92.06	4101	.014
V 34 Investigating background information					
UK/South	99.54		76.81	2500	.002
UK/North	80.99	82.67		3119	.804
North/South		117.23	87.79	2652	<.001
V 35 Accessing corporate reports and other information					
UK/South	99.12		77.07	2527	.003
UK/North	90.82	76.15		2611	.043
North/South		106.99	97.34	4656	.227

Table 9

Adoption of the internet

Groups	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
V 36 Availability of technical support staff					
UK/South	86.26		73.06	2334	.069
UK/North	80.26	61.7		1696	.005
North/South		85.06	92.25	3564	.335
V 37 Costs					
UK/South	78.09		71.69	2274	.354
UK/North	73.1	57.48		1478	.010
North/South		76.59	90.72	2893	.042
V 38 Attitude of editors and managers					
UK/South	71.91		82.46	2477	.148
UK/North	81.47	62.51		1742	.003
North/South		70.96	104.98	2426	<.001
V 39 Attitude of Journalists					
UK/South	73.48		81.64	2578	.257
UK/North	76.58	65.94		2035	.105
North/South		76.08	98.85	2846	.002

Table 10
Information-gathering techniques

Groups	UK Mean ranks	North Mean ranks	South Mean ranks	M-W U statistic	Significance (p)
V 40 Face to face conversations					
UK/South	102.51		75.88	2372	<.001
UK/North	79.87	81.77		3046	.708
North/South		119.2	85.47	3389	<.001
V 41 Telephone conversation					
UK/South	102.51		75.88	2372	<.001
UK/South	102.51		75.88	2372	<.001
North/South		119.2	85.47	3389	<.001
V 42 Search Engines					
UK/South	100.82		77.8	2546	.001
UK/North	86.38	77.35		2770	.151
North/South		112.47	92.6	4130	.008
V 43 Weblogs					
UK/South	79.64		77.99	2623	.007
UK/South	79.64		77.99	2623	.007
North/South		105.19	95.36	447	.192
V 44 Newsfeeds – RSS					
UK/South	99.66		77.71	2622	.011
UK/North	83.48	78.46		2893	.481
North/South		109.45	91.37	4042	.021
V 45 Colleagues in the newsroom					
UK/South	99.66		77.71	2622	.011
UK/North	83.48	78.46		2893	.481
North/South		109.45	91.37	4042	.021
V 46 Personal archives					
UK/South	67.2		95.85	2221	<.001
UK/North	85.61	100.52		3399	.069
North/South		94.61	111.74	3919.500	.036/2=
					.018
V 47 Public library					
UK/South	77.98		86.02	2881.5	.259
UK/North	68.04	85.4		2265.5	.013
North/South		104.85	93.6	4291	.149